

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on December 21, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 8-14 were pending. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 were rejected and claim 14 was indicated as being of allowable subject matter. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. With this Amendment, claims 1-6 and 8-14 are amended and claims 15-20 are new. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wong et al. (US 6,119,933). Of these claims, claims 1 and 5 are independent claims.

It is respectfully submitted that Wong et al. fails to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1. In particular, Wong et al. fails to teach or suggest "accessing the plurality of user interface fields, wherein some of the user interface fields includes a set of modifiable access properties that indicate a level of access needed to access that user interface field" and "controlling a value in each user interface field displayed on the point-of-sale system during a normal mode of operation by comparing the level of access indicated in the access profile of a user of the point-of sale system with the level of access of each user interface field that is to be displayed." Instead, in col. 8, lines 59-67 and col. 9, lines 1-4, Wong et al. discloses a "function" that is "assigned a minimum security access level" and "a user ID that defines what access level the user has to the menu function and which customer bases may be opened." Wong et al. fails to disclose a user interface field, let alone the control of a value in a user interface field by comparing an access profile of a user to a level of access of each user interface field. For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is in allowable form. Further, the Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-4 and 12-14 are also in allowable form at least based on their relation to claim 1. However, dependent claim 2-4 and 12-14 are in condition for other reasons. For example, Wong et al. fails to teach or suggest "accessing user interface fields that are highlighted, wherein highlighted user interface fields are those user interface fields that include access properties that can be assigned a level of access." Wong et al. fails to teach user interface fields, let alone highlighted user interface fields.

It is respectfully submitted that Wong et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 5. In particular, Wong et al. fails to teach or suggest "an access control module configured

to manage access of a plurality of user interface fields for each user of the point of sale system” of which the access control module includes “a display management module configured to instruct the point-of-sale system if values in user interface fields should be rendered by comparing the access levels of each user interface field to the access profile of a user.” Instead, in col. 8, lines 59-67 and col. 9, lines 1-4, Wong et al. discloses a “function” that is “assigned a minimum security access level” and “a user ID that defines what access level the user has to the menu function and which customer bases may be opened.” Wong et al. fails to disclose a user interface field, let alone managing the rendering of values in a user interface field by comparing an access profile of a user to a level of access of each user interface field. For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claim 5 is in allowable form. Further, the Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 6 and 8-11 are also in allowable form at least based on their relation to claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that new claims 15-20 are also in condition for allowance. It is respectfully submitted that Wong et al. fails to teach or suggest a value in each user interface field being prevented from rendering, being rendered or being rendered and modifiable based on the level of access of the user interface field and the access profile of the user. In conclusion, the Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims 1-6 and 8-20 are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Leanne R. Taveggia/
Leanne R. Taveggia, Reg. No. 53,675
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

LRT/jme